

DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH

The Effects of Discrimination on Job Satisfaction in the Military: Comparing Evidence from the Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey and the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A


Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

by

James B. Stewart, Ph.D.
Labor Studies and Industrial Relations
and
African and African-American Studies
Penn State University

Summer 2001

20020529 100



DEOMI Research Series Pamphlet 01-5

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>						
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 24 -01-2002		2. REPORT TYPE Research		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) June - August 2001		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Effects of Discrimination on Job Satisfaction in the Military: Comparing Evidence from the Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey and the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER N00014-97-1005		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER N/A		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER N/A		
				5d. PROJECT NUMBER N/A		
6. AUTHOR(S) James B. Stewart				5e. TASK NUMBER N/A		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER N/A		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Directorate of Research Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute 740 O'Malley Road MS9121 Patrick Air Force Base, FL 32925-3399				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER RSP-01-5		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22032				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) ONR		
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) N/A		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT This study examines the extent to which experiences perceived as racial discrimination by victims affect reported levels of job-related satisfaction among military personnel. Data from the <i>Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey</i> (AFEOS) and the <i>Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey</i> (MEOCS) are analyzed separately. Comparison of the two analyses confirms positive relations among racial/ethnic groups or, more generally, a healthy climate for equal opportunity is associated with higher levels of satisfaction related to job security, opportunities to acquire skills, and overall job satisfaction. Conversely, experiencing discrimination attributable to military sources is associated with lower satisfaction levels. Recommendations are offered to include additional items in the MEOCS, based on items included in the AFEOS, to enable more detailed longitudinal assessments of discrimination experienced by survey respondents.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Discrimination, Equal Opportunity, Job Satisfaction						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT		18. NUMBER OF PAGES	
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Jerry C. Scarpate	
U	U	U	UU		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (321) 494-2676	

**The Effects of Discrimination on Job Satisfaction in the Military:
Comparing Evidence from the Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey and the
Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey**

James B. Stewart, Ph.D.
Penn State University

Abstract

This study examines the extent to which experiences perceived as racial discrimination by victims affect reported levels of job-related satisfaction among military personnel. Data from the *Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey* (AFEOS) and the *Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey* (MEOCS) are analyzed separately. Comparison of the two analyses confirms positive relations among racial/ethnic groups or, more generally, a healthy climate for equal opportunity is associated with higher levels of satisfaction related to job security, opportunities to acquire skills, and overall job satisfaction. Conversely, experiencing discrimination attributable to military sources is associated with lower satisfaction levels. Recommendations are offered to include additional items in the MEOCS, based on items included in the AFEOS, to enable more detailed longitudinal assessments of discrimination experienced by survey respondents.

Summer 2001

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and should not be construed to represent the official position of DEOMI, the military Services, or the Department of Defense.

**Effects of Discrimination on Job Satisfaction in the Military:
Comparing Evidence from the Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey and the
Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey**

James B. Stewart, Ph.D.
Professor of Labor Studies and Industrial Relations
and
African and African American Studies
Penn State University

Introduction

This investigation extends previous analyses of the effects of discrimination victimization on job satisfaction and perceptions of race relations and the climate for equal opportunity in the U.S. military (Stewart 2000 a,b). Recent interest in the state of race relations in the Department of Defense (DoD) was sparked by the November 1999 release of the *Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey* (AFEOS) (Scarville et al., 1999). Over 76,000 members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard were surveyed between September 1996 and February 1997, with an overall response rate of 53% (Scarville et. al, 1999; p. iii). Significantly, approximately 67% of respondents reported experiencing a DoD-related incident within the last 12 months, while 65% experienced an incident in the local community. In addition, 23% reported that family members other than themselves had experienced some type of incident (Scarville, et al., 1999; p. 41). The report summarizing the survey results contains a wealth of detailed information about incidents including members' perceptions of the efficacy of official actions taken in response to victims' complaints (e.g. satisfaction with the outcome of a complaint, actions taken in response to a complaint) (Scarville et. al, 1999).

The information embedded in the responses to the AFEOS is of immense value for developing and enhancing policies and procedures promoting equal opportunity in the Armed Forces. However, the usefulness of this resource can be enhanced if the applicability of research findings can be extended beyond the time frame covered by the survey. This study constitutes a preliminary effort to conjoin information from the AFEOS with relatively comparable information from the *Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey* (MEOCS).

The MEOCS database contains valuable information about perceptions of the equal opportunity climate and organizational effectiveness. Survey responses have been accumulated since the early 1990s, and thus provide a longitudinal perspective on the issues of concern to this study. To the extent that similar patterns are observed in the AFEOS and MEOCS responses, policy makers can have greater confidence in using findings based on analysis of the AFEOS data to refine existing policies and procedures or develop new strategies to promote the DoD's vision of equal opportunity (Department of Defense, 1998).

The items from the AFEOS and the MEOCS that can be compared are identified in the second section and descriptive statistics highlighting similarities and differences in response patterns are presented. The methodology employed to undertake the comparison is described in the third section. The results of the detailed statistical analysis of the effects of discrimination on perceptions of job satisfaction based on data from the AFEOS and the MEOCS are presented and interpreted in the fourth section. The implications of the study for future research and the design of subsequent surveys are explored in the last section.

Job Satisfaction and Discrimination Measures in the AFEOS and the MEOCS

Based on the analysis of AFEOS, Stewart (2000a, b) reports that experiencing racial incidents has a negative effect on several dimensions of job satisfaction. The effects are moderated, however, if victims are satisfied with reporting and investigative processes. As would be expected, some types of incidents have stronger effects on job satisfaction than others. Specifically, incidents perceived to affect promotion opportunities and/or obtaining career-enhancing assignments have the largest impact. Offensive encounters involving DoD personnel and incidents involving family members also have significant adverse effects on job satisfaction (Stewart, 2000b).

Direct information about the relationship between racial incidents and job satisfaction cannot be generated from the MEOCS. In fact, most questions in the MEOCS do not solicit information about actual experiences. Instead, many of the questions ask respondents to assess the likelihood that specific types of incidents COULD occur in a respondent's work unit. However, a limited number of items in the MEOCS examine direct experiences, thereby allowing direct comparisons to AFEOS responses.

There are three comparable questions about job satisfaction in the AFEOS and the MEOCS. Job security is examined in item 26c of the AFEOS and in item 71 in the MEOCS. Chances to acquire valuable job skills are explored in item 26g of the AFEOS and in item 72 of the MEOCS. A global measure of job satisfaction is included as item 26h in the AFEOS and in item 73 in the MEOCS. In each case, however, there are differences in the manner in which the questions are framed and in the wording of the response options between the two instruments that could introduce variations in respondents' interpretations.

In the AFEOS, question 26 is a general stem "How satisfied are you with", followed by seven separate areas for which responses are requested, including the three noted above. In the MEOCS, the stem of the question is "Level of satisfaction with". In the AFEOS, the response options are 1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = dissatisfied; 3 = neither satisfied or dissatisfied; 4 = satisfied; 5 = very satisfied. In the MEOCS, the response items are 1 = very satisfied; 2 = moderately satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 = somewhat dissatisfied; 5 = very dissatisfied. To create comparability, the MEOCS data were recoded such that higher numbers indicate more favorable ratings.

There is less comparability between the AFEOS and the MEOCS with respect to questions soliciting assessments of the quality of race relations and/or the climate for equal opportunity. A similar difficulty exists in identifying comparable information about incidents of discrimination.

Item 61c in the AFEOS focuses specifically on race relations: "To what extent at your installation/ship are race/ethnic relations good?" The most comparable question in the MEOCS is item 111, which solicits responses to the statement, "I personally would rate the equal opportunity climate in this organization . . ." (very poor to very good). The construct of "equal opportunity climate" in the MEOCS is obviously different than that of "race relations" in the AFEOS. In addition, the organizational unit for which the assessment is to be rendered differs. In the case of the MEOCS, the unit of observation (organization) is typically smaller than in the AFEOS (installation/ship). As a consequence, the AFEOS assessments may be less reliable and exhibit greater variation than is the case for the MEOCS.

A similar difficulty exists in identifying comparable information about incidents of discrimination. The AFEOS responses focuses on three general categories of incidents: "Member Incident-DoD," "Member Incident-Community," and "Member/Family Incident." Within the category "Member Incident-DoD," there are three general types of incidents: "Offensive Encounters-DoD" (insensitivity), "Threat/Harm-DoD" (harassment), and what in this analysis will be termed "DoD Discrimination." This latter category consists of discriminatory incidents involving assignment or career, evaluations, punishment, and training/test scores.

In the MEOCS, there are only two items exploring discrimination victimization. These items lack the specificity and detail found in the AFEOS. To illustrate, item 101 in the MEOCS is: "I have personally experienced an incident of discrimination (racial, sexual, or sexual harassment) directed at me from *military* sources (including civilians employed by the military). Thus responses to the MEOCS can reflect either race or sex discrimination or both. As a result, it would be expected, *ceteris paribus*, that the proportion of respondents reporting a discriminatory experience should be greater than is the case for the AFEOS. Since no guidance is provided to respondents, it is possible that responses could encompass not only the AFEOS DoD Discrimination category, but also the broader Member Incident-DoD category. Item 104 in the MEOCS is: "I have personally experienced an incident of discrimination (racial, sexual, or sexual harassment) from *non-military* sources." This item should correlate significantly with the "Member Incident-Community" and "Member/Family Incident" categories in the AFEOS.

The items discussed above constitute the core focus of the present investigation. The methodology employed to compare the linkages between discrimination and job satisfaction using the AFEOS and MEOCS databases is described below.

Data and Analytical Framework

To maximize potential comparability between the AFEOS and MEOCS data, the MEOCS sample is restricted to responses from surveys conducted during 1996 and 1997. This time period encompasses the period during which the AFEOS was administered (September 1996 -- February 1997). This results in a sample of approximately 100,000 MEOCS respondents compared to approximately 35,000 AFEOS responses. Table 1 contains the means and standard deviations for variables relevant to this investigation. Note that the variable means and standard deviations are reported separately for men and women as well as for the entire sample. Casual observation reveals only slight differences between the two samples for the means of the three job satisfaction measures.

In contrast to the pattern for the job satisfaction measures, there are large differences between the mean of the variable measuring the quality of race relations in the AFEOS and the variable capturing the evaluation of the EO climate in the MEOCS. As the statistics in Table 1 indicate, the race relations climate is evaluated more favorably by AFEOS respondents than is the EO climate by MEOCS respondents. The magnitude of the disparity suggests that the two measures are not comparable and actually contain very different information.

The separate reporting of means for men and women in Table 1 is designed in particular to avoid mis-measurement deriving from the aggregation of racial and sexual discrimination in the MEOCS. Since women are disproportionately victims of sexual discrimination and sexual harassment, their MEOCS responses are more likely to reflect a combination of racial and sex discrimination experiences than men. Since relatively few men experience or report sexual discrimination victimization their AFEOS and MEOCS responses should be more similar than is the case for women. Examining the relevant statistics in Table 1 suggests that for men, there are similar means for the AFEOS variable measuring the prevalence of discrimination in assignments, evaluation, or training and the MEOCS variable measuring the prevalence of experiences of military discrimination. Note, however, that the means for women for these two variables display large differences. The pattern is consistent with the hypothesis advanced above, as the overall prevalence of military discrimination reported by women in the MEOCS (.09) is greater than the reported prevalence of racial discrimination in assignments, evaluation, and training in the AFEOS (.04). Thus it appears that the experiences reported in the MEOCS reflect sex discrimination in addition to racial discrimination.

It is not clear from the statistics in Table 1 that there is any comparability between the measurement of non-military discrimination in the MEOCS and the various indicators of non-DoD related racial incidents in the AFEOS. While the mean of the AFEOS measure of the prevalence of incidents fitting the Threat/Harm Community typology is comparable to that of the MEOCS non-military discrimination indicator, the former construct is much broader. This suggests that the two measures contain very different information.

TABLE 1 – COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Variable	MEOCS			MEOCS			AFEOCS					
	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL		MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
A. Job Satisfaction												
Job Security	3.67	1.24	3.67	1.21	3.67	1.23	3.61	1.07	3.61	1.04	3.61	1.07
Acquiring Job Skills	3.45	1.34	3.54	1.32	3.47	1.34	3.43	1.22	3.38	1.22	3.43	1.22
Overall Job Satisfaction	3.54	1.26	3.51	1.27	3.54	1.26	3.59	1.10	3.47	1.18	3.58	1.11
B. Race Relations/EO Climate												
Race Relations							3.88	1.08	3.61	1.08	3.84	1.08
EO Climate	3.43	1.03	3.19	1.04	3.39	1.04						
C. Negative Job Experiences – Non-Racial												
Assignment, Evaluation, Training							.68	.47	.68	.47	.68	.47
Punishment							.07	.25	.08	.26	.07	.25
D. Discrimination – Racial Job/Assignment												
Assignment, Evaluation, Training							.11	.31	.14	.34	.11	.31
Assignment, Evaluation							.08	.27	.12	.32	.08	.27
Training/Test Scores							.03	.17	.03	.17	.03	.17
Punishment							.04	.19	.05	.21	.04	.19
Discrimination – Military	.10	.30	.22	.41	.12	.33						
E. Non-job Racial Incidents Measures												
Family Encounters/Threats - DoD							.04	.20	.04	.19	.04	.20
Member Incident - DoD							.68	.47	.65	.48	.68	.47
Offensive Encounters - Community							.67	.47	.60	.49	.65	.48
Threat/Harm - Community							.13	.33	.08	.26	.12	.33
Member Incident - Community							.67	.47	.60	.49	.66	.47
Member/Family Incident							.23	.42	.24	.43	.23	.42
Services Discrimination							.13	.34	.16	.37	.14	.34
Discrimination – Non-Military	.11	.31	.09	.28	.11	.31						
F. Composite Measures												
Any Incident												
Military & Non-military Discrimination	.17	.37	.29	.46	.19	.39	.77	.42	.75	.43	.77	.42
G. Other Job/Assignment – Racial												
Offensive Encounters - DoD							.67	.47	.64	.48	.66	.47
Threat/Harm - DoD							.10	.30	.09	.29	.10	.30

There is also a lack of correspondence between the measure of the overall prevalence of experiences of discrimination in the MEOCS and the measure of the experience of any type of racial incident in the AFEOS. The magnitude of the disparity between the two measures is extremely large (.17 in the MEOCS versus .77 in the AFEOS).

The AFEOS database allows negative job-related incidents unrelated to race to be distinguished from those in which race is perceived to have played a role. Such incidents are likely to have a major effect on job satisfaction independent of racial incidents, per se. As indicated in Table 1, over two-thirds of the respondents to the AFEOS survey experienced such incidents related to assignments, evaluation, or training and another seven percent experienced punishment incidents not related to race.

The analytical framework developed in the next section is designed to incorporate the nuances discussed above that are reflected in Table 1.

Methodology

The general empirical model used in this investigation takes the following form:

- (1) Satisfaction = f(Race Relations/EO Climate; Discrimination Experience;
Race/Ethnicity; Gender; Branch of Service; Paygrade; Education)

The structure of this model is designed to allow comparable variables to be employed in examining the effects of discrimination on satisfaction measures in the AFEOS and MEOCS samples. As noted previously, there are differences in data items that preclude the use of the full range of information available in each data set. The definitions for each of the specific variables included in the model can be found in Appendix A.

Three measures of satisfaction are examined: JOBSEC, JOBSKILLS, and JOBSAT. These variables measure respectively, respondents' perception of the degree of job security, opportunities to obtain skills, and overall job satisfaction. Stewart (2000a) examined the effects of racial incidents on one of these measures, JOBSAT, along with four other measures of satisfaction with military life.

As discussed previously, the measures of the quality of race relations and/or the EO climate are different in the AFEOS and the MEOCS. In the model analyzing AFEOS data, this variable is the respondent's answer to Item 61c in the AFEOS, i.e., "To what extent at your installation/ship are race/ethnic relations good?" In the analysis of the MEOCS data this variable is respondent's answer to item 111, i.e., "I personally would rate the equal opportunity climate in this organization . . ." (very poor to very good). In both cases, it is anticipated that more positive assessments of race relations or the EO climate will be associated with greater satisfaction with the job.

The treatment of a respondent's perception of being a victim of discrimination also differs between the AFEOS and the MEOCS, as noted previously. In the examination of the AFEOS data, the discrimination variable is a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent has experienced "DoD Discrimination," i.e., discriminatory incidents involving assignment or career, evaluations, punishment, and training/test scores (0 = No, 1 = Yes). In the analysis of the MEOCS data, the discrimination measure is the respondent's answer to item 101, "I have personally experienced an incident of discrimination (racial, sexual, or sexual harassment) directed at me from *military* sources (including civilians employed by the military) (0 = No, 1 = Yes). As indicated earlier, responses to the MEOCS item can reflect either race or sex discrimination, or both. As a consequence, the coefficients may reflect different information content in the two samples. In both analyses, it is expected that the coefficient of the discrimination variable will be negative, i.e., satisfaction should decrease if an individual has experienced discrimination. Because there are no comparable measures of non-military discrimination in the two databases, no variables are included to control for the influence of this type of discriminatory experience on job satisfaction.

It is reasonable to expect that the relationship between discrimination victimization and job satisfaction may vary across racial/ethnic groups. The treatment of racial/ethnic groups in this model is identical to that employed in Stewart (2000a). Specifically, a set of racial/ethnic dummy variables is included (ASIAN, BLACK, HISP, and NATAM), with Whites constituting the reference group. It is not possible to make specific sign predictions, although Stewart (2000a) finds Hispanics, and Native Americans/Alaskan Natives consistently report higher levels of satisfaction than Whites and Asian Americans and Blacks express less overall job satisfaction than Whites.

Differences in job-related satisfaction between men and women should also be anticipated. Stewart (2000a) reports that women expressed lower levels of overall job satisfaction than men. Because separate analyses are undertaken for men and women, a variable controlling for gender (FEMALE) is only included in the analyses that combine the observations for men and women.

The remaining variables in the model are essentially controls designed to account for other factors that are likely to influence reported levels of satisfaction. There are dummy variables for each service except the Army, which serves as the reference group (USAF, USN, USMC, USCG). These dummy variables are proxies for Service-specific cultural protocols and approaches to duty performance. In addition, these variables are indicators of Service-specific race relations and EO climate characteristics. Stewart (2000a) finds that Navy personnel are typically less satisfied than the Army reference group and that Marine Corps respondents express the highest levels of satisfaction. Dummy variables are also included to examine how satisfaction is affected by rank. Stewart (2000a) indicates that the level of satisfaction generally increases with paygrade and the influence of PAYGRADE is relatively large compared to the other factors. Finally, there are controls for level of education. Stewart (2000a) finds that respondents

who had completed some college or had a college degree express lower levels of satisfaction than their less educated counterparts.

Multiple regression analysis is used to examine the influences of the various independent variables on each of the dependent variables. The AFEOS data were pre-weighted by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) to mirror Service demographics. In the AFEOS analysis, White male Army members in paygrades E1- E4, with a high school education or less constitute the reference group. The MEOCS data are unweighted, and Army units are over-represented. The control group in the MEOCS analysis is the same except that the control paygrade is E1-E3.

The results of the various analyses are presented and interpreted in the next section.

Results

The results obtained for JOBSEC, JOBSKILLS, and JOBSAT are presented, respectively, in Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C. Only the coefficients that are statistically significant are shown. In general, limiting the set of independent variables to allow comparable factors to be included in the analyses of the two samples did not produce markedly different results in the analysis of the AFEOS sample, compared to the findings reported in Stewart (2000). The principal concern in this investigation is with the results for the Race Relations/EO Climate and Discrimination Experience measures.

In the JOBSEC regressions (Table 2A) the respective measures all have the predicted signs and are statistically significant with the exception of MILDISC in the MEOCS analysis for women. The relative contribution to the overall explanatory power of RACEREL and DODDISC is comparable in the AFEOS regression. However, in the MEOCS regressions EOCLIM makes a much larger contribution to the overall explanatory power of the model than MILDISC. This pattern could reflect, in part, that the broader construct of the EO climate is more closely linked to this measure of job satisfaction than race relations, per se. It may also reflect the diffuse content of the variable, MILDISC, discussed previously. As noted previously, MILDISC is not statistically significant in the MEOCS analysis for women.

The same patterns are found in the JOBSKILLS and JOBSAT regressions. In these cases, the coefficient of MILDISC is negative and statistically significant in the MEOCS regression for women. The relative contribution of the Race Relations/EO Climate variables is largest in the JOBSAT regressions.

Overall, the effect of a DoD discrimination experience on satisfaction measures ranges from -.392 to -.457 for men and from -.374 to -.610 for women. The coefficient of FEMALE is positive in the JOBSEC and JOBSKILLS regressions, and negative in the JOBSAT regression. In all cases, the effect is small. The coefficient of FEMALE is also negative in the results for JOBSAT reported in Stewart (2000a).

TABLE 2A
REGRESSION RESULTS - JOB SECURITY

VARIABLE	MEN				AFEOS WOMEN				TOTAL				MEOS MEN				WOMEN				TOTAL			
	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA
RACREL	.141	.001	.141	.174	.002	.178	.145	.001	.146															
DODDISC	-.457	.004	-.131	-.374	.008	-.123	-.443	.003	-.130															
EOCLIM													.294	.003	.244	.300	.007	.260	.295	.003	.248			
MILDISC													-.106	.011	-.026	--	--	--	-.081	.009	-.021			
ASIAN	.083	.006	.014	--	--	--	.074	.005	.012				--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--			--
BLACK	--	--	--	-.135	.006	-.059	-.030	.003	-.011				.066	.009	.020	--	--	--	.052	.008	.016			
HISP	.048	.004	.013	.081	.009	.021	.052	.003	.014				.117	.011	.027	--	--	--	.105	.011	.024			
NATAM	-.066	.010	-.006	--	--	--	-.054	.009	-.005				--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--			--
FEMALE	--	--	--	--	--	--	.043	.003	.014				--	--	--	--	--	--	.100	.008	.030			
USAF	.041	.003	.016	.030	.006	.014	.041	.002	.017				-.071	.008	-.023	-.039	.017	-.014	-.064	.007	-.021			
USN	.258	.003	.107	.181	.006	.078	.247	.002	.103				.083	.012	.018	.122	.026	.028	.091	.011	.019			
USMC	.221	.003	.067	.275	.014	.048	.223	.003	.065				.088	.010	.023	.098	.030	.020	.089	.010	.023			
USCG	.021	.007	.003	--	--	--	.015	.006	.002				--	--	--	-.169	.054	-.018	-.045	.022	-.005			
PAYGRAD2	-.143	.002	-.067	-.066	.006	-.031	-.130	.002	-.061				.084	.008	.029	.091	.018	.030	.085	.007	.029			
PAYGRAD3	-.228	.005	-.065	--	--	--	-.195	.005	-.056				-.076	.011	-.019	-.051	.022	-.015	-.070	.010	-.019			
PAYGRAD4	-.296	.006	-.073	-.186	.014	-.042	-.279	.005	-.068				.176	.022	.022	--	--	--	.151	.020	.019			
SOMECOL	-.017	.003	-.008	.021	.006	.010	-.014	.002	-.006				-.044	.008	-.018	--	--	--	-.042	.007	-.017			
COLDEG	--	--	--	-.112	.011	-.044	-.017	.004	-.007				-.066	.010	-.024	-.080	.021	-.031	-.069	.009	-.025			
INTERCEPT	3.129	.005		3.038	.011		3.109	.004					2.673	.013		2.745	.029		2.667	.012				
ADJR **2	.063			.086			.065						.064			.069			.064					
STD ERROR	1.040			.994			1.034						1.199			1.165			1.194					
F	4756.79			1062.03			5344.51						654.48			138.36			738.42					

TABLE 2B
REGRESSION RESULTS -- JOB SKILLS

VARIABLE	MEN				AFEOS WOMEN				TOTAL				MEN				MEOCS WOMEN				TOTAL			
	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA
RACREL	.164	.001	.144	.203	.003	.178	.169	.001	.149															
DODDISC	-.452	.004	-.114	-.610	.009	-.172	-.479	.004	-.123															
EOCLIM													.310	.003	.239	.329	.008	.260	.315	.003	.244			
MILDISC													-.088	.011	-.020	-.048	.019	-.015	-.076	.010	-.018			
ASIAN	.166	.007	.024	.075	.015	.011	.157	.006	.023				.055	.019	.007									
BLACK	.239	.003	.073	.209	.007	.078	.234	.003	.074				.229	.010	.063	.151	.019	.051	.216	.008	.062			
HISP	.184	.004	.044	.188	.011	.041	.187	.004	.044				.139	.012	.029				.125	.011	.026			
NATAM	-.026	.012	-.002	.245	.027	.021																		
FEMALE	--	--	--	--	--	--	.017	.003	.005										.156	.009	.043			
USAF	.171	.003	.061	-.082	.007	-.032	.135	.003	.049				.075	.009	.023	-.042	.019	-.014	.055	.008	.017			
USN	.132	.003	.048	-.043	.007	-.016	.112	.003	.041				.130	.013	.025				.108	.012	.021			
USMC	.168	.004	.045	.055	.016	.008	.146	.004	.037				.213	.011	.052				.194	.010	.045			
USCG	.065	.008	.008	-.211	.022	-.023	.003	.007	.004							-.371	.059	-.037						
PAYGRAD2	.246	.003	.101	.114	.006	.046	.229	.003	.094				.157	.008	.051	.079	.020	.023	.145	.008	.046			
PAYGRAD3	.599	.006	.149	.656	.014	.167	.605	.005	.151				.235	.012	.056	.207	.024	.056	.228	.011	.055			
PAYGRAD4	.636	.006	.138	.650	.017	.124	.636	.006	.136				.259	.023	.030				.223	.021	.025			
SOMECOL	-.010	.003	-.004	-.056	.007	-.023	-.017	.003	-.007															
COLDEG	-.018	.005	-.006	-.073	.013	-.024	-.027	.005	-.009				.061	.010	.020				.058	.009	.020			
INTERCEPT	2.438	.005		2.581	.013		2.472	.005					2.206	.014		2.405	.031		2.207	.013				
ADJ R **2	.081			.113			.084						.074			.073			.074					
STD ERROR	1.174			1.147			1.172						1.289			1.271			1.286					
F	6202.87			1458.50			7029.65						772.91			145.52			857.58					

TABLE 2C
REGRESSION RESULTS – OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION

VARIABLE	MEN			AFEOS WOMEN			TOTAL			MEN			MEOCS WOMEN			TOTAL		
	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA	COEF	S.E.	BETA
RACEREL	.188	.001	.184	.211	.003	.192	.192	.001	.186									
DODDISC	-.392	.004	-.109	-.416	.008	-.122	-.397	.003	-.112									
EOCLIM										.363	.003	.298	.367	.007	.302	.365	.003	.301
MILDISC										-.106	.010	-.026	-.042	.018	-.014	-.088	.009	-.023
ASIAN	.199	.006	.032	.108	.015	.017	.185	.005	.030									
BLACK	.204	.003	.069	.120	.007	.046	.186	.003	.065	.158	.009	.047	.099	.018	.034	.147	.008	.045
HISP	.146	.004	.038	.264	.011	.059	.160	.003	.041	.129	.011	.029	.059	.028	.012	.119	.010	.026
NATAM	--	--	--	.474	.026	.042	.060	.010	.005	.048	.020	.006	.121	.039	.018	.061	.018	.008
FEMALE	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.022	.003	-.007	--	--	--	--	--	--	.064	.008	.019
USAF	.051	.003	.020	-.019	.007	-.008	.041	.003	.016	.091	.008	.029	--	--	--	.079	.007	.026
USN	-.052	.003	-.021	--	--	--	-.040	.003	-.016	-.038	.012	-.008	--	--	--	-.038	.011	-.008
USMC	.159	.004	.047	.099	.016	.015	.156	.003	.044	.118	.010	.031	--	--	--	.105	.010	.026
USCG	.043	.007	.006	-.060	.021	-.007	.030	.006	.004	--	--	--	-.228	.056	-.024	--	--	--
PAYGRAD2	.344	.002	.156	.301	.006	.125	.338	.002	.152	.297	.008	.102	.220	.019	.068	.285	.007	.097
PAYGRAD3	.545	.005	.151	.615	.014	.162	.554	.005	.152	.213	.011	.054	.139	.023	.039	.199	.010	.051
PAYGRAD4	.668	.006	.161	.797	.016	.158	.684	.005	.161	.421	.021	.051	.195	.052	.022	.387	.020	.047
SOMECOL	-.064	.003	-.029	--	--	--	-.055	.002	-.025	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
COLDG	-.098	.005	-.036	-.138	.013	-.048	-.106	.004	-.039	.076	.009	.027	.059	.021	.022	.074	.009	.027
INTERCEPT	2.606	.005		2.492	.013		2.594	.004		2.104	.013		2.222	.030		2.108	.012	
ADJR **2	.100			.102			.101			.119			.100			.115		
STD ERROR	1.044			1.115			1.055			1.178			1.205			1.183		
F	7806.19			1299.70			8569.83			1299.93			204.84			1403.03		

The pattern for the Service's coefficients is inconsistent across the two samples both in terms of signs and magnitudes. There is greater consistency for the rank indicators except in the JOBSEC regressions. Consistent with the results reported in Stewart (2000a), in the JOBSKILLS and JOBSAT regressions the coefficients of PAYGRAD2, PAYGRAD3, and PAYGRAD4 are typically positive and generally increase in magnitude as rank increases. In the AFEOS analysis, the rank indicators contribute significantly to the model's overall explanatory power. However, in the MEOCS analyses the relative contribution of these variables is much smaller. The coefficients of the education variables exhibit different patterns. There are more statistically significant coefficients in the AFEOS results than in the MEOCS results.

Overall, comparison of the two analyses confirms positive relations among racial/ethnic groups or, more generally, a healthy climate for equal opportunity is associated with higher levels of satisfaction with job security, opportunities to acquire skills, and the job overall. The particular strength of the AFEOS is the detailed examination of both discrimination experiences and perceptions of the efficacy of administrative responses to discrimination complaints. The longitudinal perspective available through the MEOCS allows continuous monitoring of the trends in the quality of the EO climate. However, one of the limitations of the MEOCS is the paucity of information solicited about discrimination incidents. Usefulness of the MEOCS could be enhanced substantially by including adaptations of selected items from the AFEOS focusing on discrimination experiences. Specific recommendations are offered below.

Discussion and Implications

The revised version of the MEOCS will maintain the existing approach to the assessment of the EO climate in which most questions do not solicit information about actual experiences, and instead ask respondents to assess the likelihood that specific types of incidents could occur in their work unit. As noted, information is solicited about actual military and non-military discrimination incidents. There are currently only six items that elicit information about such experiences. This analysis has identified an overlap in coverage between the military discrimination responses in the MEOCS and responses to queries regarding DoD discrimination in the AFEOS. The DoD discrimination construct encompasses the areas of evaluation, assignments, promotions, and training. Specific information about problems in these areas would significantly assist unit leaders in using the MEOCS to implement initiatives to improve the EO climate. Modification of existing items and inclusion of an item adapted from the AFEOS could greatly enhance the operational usefulness of the MEOCS. A proposed modification to one of the existing items and a proposed additional item are presented in Appendix B.

Inclusion of the proposed item or a variant would allow longitudinal tracking of trends in discrimination experiences that could be gauged against the baseline information provided by the AFEOS. More generally, it can make a significant contribution to the continuing effort to implement fully the DoD Human Goals.

REFERENCES

Department of Defense (1998, July 24). Department of Defense Human Goals.

Scarville, J., et al. (1999). Armed forces equal opportunity survey. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.

Stewart, J. (2000a). The effects of racial incidents on satisfaction with military life: Evidence from the armed forces equal opportunity survey, Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Research Series Pamphlet, 2000-3, Patrick Air Force Base, FL: Directorate of Research.

Stewart, J. (2000b). Variation in the effects of different types of racial incidents on satisfaction with military service, Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Research Series Pamphlet, 2000-3, Patrick Air Force Base, FL: Directorate of Research.

APPENDIX A – VARIABLE NAMES AND DEFINITIONS

VARIABLE	DEFINITION
DEPENDENT	
JOBSEC	Perception of degree of job security (1-5)
JOBSKILLS	Perception of opportunities to obtain job skills (1-5)
JOBSAT	Overall satisfaction with job (1 – 5)
INDEPENDENT	
RACEREL	Perception of the quality of race relations (1-5) (AFEOS)
DODDISC	Dummy Variable = 1 if respondent reported being the target of a DoD discrimination incident, 0 otherwise (AFEOS)
EOCLIM	Perception of the quality of the EO climate (1-5) (MEOCS)
MILDISC	Dummy Variable = 1 if respondent reported being the victim of military discrimination, 0 otherwise (MEOCS)
ASIAN	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is Asian, 0 otherwise
BLACK	Dummy Variable: Value = 1 if respondent is Black; 0 otherwise
HISP	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is Hispanic, 0 otherwise
NATAM	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is Native American, 0 otherwise
FEMALE	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is female, 0 otherwise
USAF	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is in the Air Force, 0 otherwise
USN	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is in the Navy, 0 otherwise
USMC	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is in the Marines, 0 otherwise
USCG	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent is in the Coast Guard, 0 otherwise
PAYGRAD2	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent's paygrade is E5-E9, 0 otherwise (AFEOS)/ Value =1 if respondent's paygrade is E4-E9, 0 otherwise (MEOCS)
PAYGRAD3	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent's paygrade is WO1-WO5 or O1-O3, 0 otherwise
PAYGRAD4	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent's paygrade is O4-O6, 0 otherwise
SOMECOL	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent has some college education, 0 otherwise
COLDEG	Dummy Variable: Value =1 if respondent has a college degree, 0 otherwise

APPENDIX B

Proposed Modifications/Additions to the MEOCS

101. I have personally experienced an incident(S) of discrimination (racial, sexual, sexual harassment) directed at me from *military* sources (including civilians employed by the military) WITHIN THE LAST 12 MONTHS.

1 = YES

2 = NO

- 101a. The type(s) of incidents I have experienced involved the following dimensions of my job:

Yes

No

N/A

Evaluation

Assignments

Promotion

Training

Punishment